_Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)
	arv	10/065,848	LASKARIS ET AL.
ALAGIIIII OF IIII GALEGI III GA GAIIIII GAI		Examiner	Art Unit
		Tiffany A. Fetzner	2859
II Participants: Status of Application: <u>After-final before a NOA</u>			
(1) <u>Ex. Tiffany A. Fetzner</u> .		(3)	
(2) Attorney Patrick S. Yoder Reg. no. 37,479.		(4)	
Date of Interview: 24 March 2005		Time: <u>3:30pm-5pm</u>	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:			
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed: Claims 1-23			
Claims discussed: Claim 1 ,			
Prior art documents discussed: Chari et al., US patent 5,307,039 and Bryne et al., US patent 6,211,676 B1,			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  See Continuation Sheet			
Part III.			
<ul> <li>□ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>			
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
(Funding (OPE Size at tree)	Annlina	(Applicant's Panessantstin	Signature if appropriate)
(Examiner/SPE Signature)	∨hhiicaur	whhileaur a wehieseurgrive	e Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative in an effort to clarify and hopefully resolve via a clarifying amendment the features claimed by applicant, as opposed to the features argued in the MArch 18th 2005 response. No resolution resulted and the attorney requested an advisory action of each of the examiner's concerns. The advisory action accompanies this response. The examiner suggested that some problems may be resolved by clarification of applicant's claim terminology, or exchanging terminology causing confusion with equivalent, wordingthat better clarifies the actual invention. Applicant's representative indicated an Advisory was needed prior to any correction by applicant. The examiner agreed but noted that the finality of the last office action stands and is being maintained by the examiner, in view of what the finally rejected claims actually recite and require, as opposed to limitations argued but not clearly recited in applicant's claims..

Ex Inffang a Tizza AU 2859 (576) 272-224